



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0923CO-1 for Center Consolidated School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium presents a vision of a strategy designed to meet the personalized needs of students. It is unclear how the vision described in this application will decrease achievement gaps across student subgroups (i.e., ethnic minorities, English learners, special education, economically disadvantaged). The proposal indicates that all students in all schools will be included--however the application does not describe how students with disabilities, including students with significant cognitive disabilities will be included.</p> <p>The vision described does not adequately explain how the proposed SLV framework will be aligned to the new Colorado College and Career Ready Standards. The vision presented also does not adequately indicate how there will be consistent high quality implementation of effective practices.</p> <p>There are numerous general statements about College and Career Readiness, but little indication that the applicant has a clear vision of how to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to provide standard-based instruction to all students.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium in the middle of the mid-range. While the overall vision falls in the mid-range, the vision presented in this application has some elements that have the potential to improve learning and achievement.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium provides a list of schools that will participate in grant activities in a table format, as well as information about the number of participating students. However, the application does not include an adequate description of the process that was used to select schools and how they collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium towards the upper end of the mid-range due to the missing description of the process.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The SLV Framework for Personalized Learning and Teaching provides a logic model that shows the relationship between curriculum development and formative assessment work, the blended learning model, content knowledge and learning and life schools. However, this logic model fails to adequately indicate how this will result in improved student learning outcomes.</p> <p>Overall, this places San Luis Valley Consortium in the middle of the mid-range. The plan presented has elements (i.e., ongoing curriculum development and formative assessment work that leads to the development of a blended learning model) that have the potential to improve student learning outcomes; however it fails to describe a theory of change that will improve learning outcomes for all students, including special education and ELs.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium indicates that the goal is for achievement to increase across the years for all reported subgroups. For example, for ELs achievement is projected to increase from 50 to 51.7 on the Elementary Reading assessment (i.e., TCAP) between SY2010-11 and SY2016-17. However, performance decreased substantially for ELs from SY2010-11 to SY2011-12 from 50 to 42; which raises concern about whether the negative trend will be reversed in future years. The applicant provides no explanation for this decrease.</p> <p>The information in the application does not indicate that the achievement gap will be closed for some subgroups. Across the years, the</p>		

achievement gaps widen (rather than decrease) for ELs for both elementary reading and middle school math when compared to the overall group. The achievement gap also increases for free/reduced lunch (FRL) students. No data are provided about special education achievement.

The projected graduation rates increase across the years for all reported subgroups—however, the reported goals indicate that ELs (the subgroup with the most dismal graduation rate in SY2010-11) will increase their graduation rate at a lower rate than the overall population (The graduation rate for ELs is projected to go from 65.6 to 70.7 in SY2010-11 to SY2016-17—an increase of 5.1; whereas the graduation rate for the overall population increases from 79.7 to 85.9 across the years—an increase of 6.2). No information is provided about graduation rates for special education.

Overall, this places San Luis Valley Consortium at the top of the low range. The Applicant provided some evidence that achievement is likely to increase, but the overall the evidence provided is inconsistent.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium provides many examples of success in its application; however it does not provide examples for all districts in the consortium and it does not systematically provide achievement data across the content areas for the districts—for example, for Sargent only science achievement were included in the application.</p> <p>There is documentation that some schools have improved student learning achievement; and inadequate information to determine whether the achievement gap is closing.</p> <p>There is insufficient information about how student performance data will be provided to students and educators in ways that will improve and inform instruction. The Applicant also provides insufficient information about how student performance data will be provided to parents.</p> <p>No information was provided about how student learning and achievement has been advanced for ELs and special education for many of the districts in the Consortium.</p> <p>Overall, this places San Luis Valley Consortium towards the low end of the mid-range. Members of the consortium have examples of success over the past few years; however insufficient information was provided for many performance indicators for many members of the consortia.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The members of the San Luis Valley consortium appear to meet legally required reporting requirements; however, a few members of the consortia do not have structures in place to ensure that information can be easily accessed by community members and other stakeholders. Overall, the Applicant is at the upper end of the middle range, with strong indications that the members of the consortia provide many elements of transparency—and are moving towards addressing limitations.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium application describes how the state of Colorado changed some legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to provide additional autonomy. For example, the Colorado State Legislature passed HB 09-1319 and HB 09-285 which address concurrent/dual enrollment. Letters of support are included in the appendices from the Colorado Race to the Top Director and the Colorado Commissioner of Education's office. Overall, this places San Luis Valley Consortium at the top of the high range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium described how the consortium engaged stakeholders and got support for the proposal. Support for this proposal by teachers is shown by MOUs which were signed by the leadership of association membership in districts with collective bargaining agreements. In the districts without collective bargaining agreements in place, the results of the survey distributed to teachers at an Organized Project Overview and Feedback Session provides evidence of the support of teachers.</p>		

The proposal indicated that comments were solicited from students, parents, business interests and community members, but information is not provided about comments which were received.

Overall, this places the San Luis Valley application in the middle of the high range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley Consortium identified numerous needs and gaps by conducting several needs assessments; however the applicant does not provide a detailed plan which indicates how these identified needs and gaps will be addressed.

Overall, this places the San Luis Valley application towards the lower end of the middle range. While there is an inadequate plan, the results of the needs assessments provide with consortium with valuable information.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium application describes several important elements of a high-quality plan (i.e., plans to adopt a curriculum aligned to the Common Core, use of formative assessments, targeted early literacy, web-based instruction, etc.) —however, it is vague how these individual components fit into the overall plan.</p> <p>The details are sparse about how the Applicant plans to address some components of a high quality plan. It does not describe how it will provide access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. The Applicant does not adequately describe how the approach proposed will engage and empower high needs learners. The Applicant also does not describe how this approach will enable students receiving special education services to access important age-appropriate content; and, does not describe how accommodations will be used to facilitate access for Special Education and ELs.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium toward the high end of the middle range.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>One of the strength of the Consortium is the use of professional learning communities that have the potential to increase teacher knowledge and skills. However, the consortium is relying heavily on outsiders to provide needed training; and does not have a plan that will increase local capacity. It has not yet developed a coherent plan about how to provide teachers with the skills and knowledge needed to successfully instruct students using personalized learning environments. The application indicates that the Consortium will be relying on a,--still to be selected--learning platform vender to help define a professional learning plan to support educators.</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium does not describe how it will provide all educators with the skills and knowledge needed to confidently instruct all learners using College and Career Ready Standards. For example, no information was provided about training for teachers who work with some high needs groups (i.e., special education and EL teachers). The proposal also did not describe how principal's practice will be improved.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium in the middle of the mid-range. The Consortium has some general plans about how to get educators engaged in training, but has not presented a coherent description of this training.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium application provides weak evidence that the consortium has a consortium governance structure in place that will provide support and services to all participating schools. The applicant indicates that the districts operate with a great degree of</p>		

autonomy, but does not adequately describe how they will work together as members of the consortia. The structure does provide districts with great flexibility—but the applicant does not provide information about the level of flexibility and autonomy at the school-level.

A strength of the application is that the consortium member have experience providing adaptable and fully accessible instruction to students with special needs due to their relationship with the BOCES—however, no information was provided about how learning resources and instructional practices were made accessible to struggling learners in a general education setting. Overall, this places the San Luis Consortium in the middle of the middle range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Due of the remoteness of its location, the San Luis Valley Consortium faces many challenges in ensuring that all students have access to necessary content, tools, and learning resources outside of school. A strength of the application is that the Consortium will hire an IT Coordinator. Some of the districts in the consortium reported that 50% or fewer of the students' families have internet in the home. Great gains are being made in getting the infrastructure into place with the use of wireless technology, expanding broadband service, etc.

The applicant describes how it is putting a system into place that will manage student achievement data. The applicant did not indicate whether this system will allow the export of information in an open data format.

Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium the high end of the mid-range. Due to the remoteness of its location and dispersed nature of its population, it faces many challenges. The consortium has a good grasp of the issues—though it still has a ways to go to get the infrastructure in place.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Applicant describes a continuous improvement process that will be used for Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS). The RTI process is described in detail. A strength is that the RTI model is based on the model developed by the Colorado Department of Education. However, the Applicant does not provide a coherent overall strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium in the middle of the mid-range since much work still needs to be done to create comprehensive continuous improvement processes.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium comprehensively describes a process that will be used for ongoing communication and engagement. The Applicant will provide information about the project on its website, and hard copies of reports will be printed for community members without internet access. Meetings will be open to the public. The Consortium also plans to use newer social media outlets, such as Facebook and Twitter, to communicate and engage stakeholders. This places the Applicant at the top of the high range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The members of the San Luis Valley Consortium do not currently use the same performance measures. The Consortium members are making progress towards addressing the issue, but have not yet identified the metrics that will be used for some of the performance measures. It is laudable that the Consortium is carefully and thoughtfully seeking to identify the most valuable metrics—however, it is unclear that the members will be able to agree on what those metrics should be.</p> <p>Several tables were included which listed several performance measures—as well as targets for some of those measures. However, based upon the text describing the performance measures, the metrics are confusing and unclear. Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium in the middle range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley Consortium application includes a bulleted list of areas that may be evaluated, but provides insufficient detail. A strength is that the San Luis Valley Consortia recognizes the challenges facing a rural consortia—and plans to hire an external evaluator if the grant is funded. Overall, this places the Consortium at the lower end of the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium budget is reasonable for what it proposes to do. Comprehensive narratives, that include rationales for investments and priorities, are included for the overall budget and for the project-level budgets. It is possible to distinguish between one-time investments and recurring operational costs. Overall, the Applicant scores at the top of the high end for its budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium provided very little specific information about how the project's goals will be sustained after the end of the project. Details were sparse regarding support from State and local government leaders, and financial support. A budget for three years after the end of the grant was not included in the application, nor were potential sources and uses of funds identified. Overall, the San Luis Valley Consortium scored at the low end of the middle range, since little evidence was provided that that it would be sustainable.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium recognized the importance of leveraging resources and expertise, and has identified several partnerships and proposes to work together with them to address the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students. Signed letters of support were included in the applicant.</p> <p>The identified partners have the potential to provide really add to what the Consortium is proposing to do—however, Inadequate information was provided about the partnerships to determine if they would be sustainable.</p> <p>Performance measures were identified, but little detail was provided regarding how the data would be used to target resources.</p> <p>Overall, this places the San Luis Valley Consortium towards the middle of the mid-range. The partnerships described have good potential, but overall insufficient detail was provided.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The San Luis Valley Consortium addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching. The Applicant met Absolute Priority 1. Each of the core educational assurance areas are addressed at some point in the application.</p> <p>The Applicant articulated a vision which guided the development of a comprehensive and coherent plan. The proposed plan has some limitations as described in this review, but overall it is a high-quality plan.</p>		

Total	210	127
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0923CO-2 for Center Consolidated School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A) (1)</p> <p>This section gives some evidence of a reform effort that encompasses the four core assurance areas. The project is for personalized learning for all students in all grades across the 14 districts within the consortium with a different initial focus at each school level. This section provides evidence of the scope of the project in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) all students will be co-creators of their Individual Career and Academic Plans (ICAPs), which will allow every student to explore multiple postsecondary options and prepare for their chosen path 2) educators will be supported in providing personalized learning experiences to match their students needs 3) plan is focused on providing essential professional development for educators in personalizing academic instruction to match students' unique needs to ensure that students can become more effective and self-motivated learners in the PK-12 continuum 4) plan includes use of practices that teach students to self-assess and track progress so that all students know what they know, what they need, and how they learn best 5) project begins with a strong focus on literacy that includes support for families and caregivers 6) students will receive more personalized instruction through introduction of blended learning in live, small group instruction from a teacher and high quality digital content that allows student to self-pace 7) content will be delivered through multiple modalities adapted to students learning styles and needs with standards-based grading and student involved formative assessments 8) plan provides a life skills curriculum designed to explore career and education pathways, break down barriers to post secondary attainment 9) students will develop individualized career and academic plan (ICAP) in line with state requirements 10) excellent teachers will be trained and shared across the consortium 11) plan requires that students master both core academic standards, which are aligned with Common Core Standards, as well as learning and life skills, including critical thinking and problem solving, finding and suing information technology, creativity and innovation, civic responsibility, work ethic, personal responsibility, effective communications and collaboration 12) reforms in project will accelerate academic achievement and help all students meet graduation requirements, meet the state's higher education admission requirements (HEAR) and graduate form college prepared for college and careers 13) plan focuses on one core academic program per school level at a time, uses pilots to test and improve programs, and invests in infrastructure building 14) there will be widespread rollout of the grant 		

15) curriculum will be aligned to Common core Standards across all 14 districts

16) professional development/training for all educators including counselors in all areas in grant

18) regular and ongoing assessments to determine academic achievement, growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness

The section presents important information about the scope of the project. What is lacking is a description of how the intended work will build on existing work and how the elements will be designed and delivered within each of the LEAS that comprise the consortium. For example, a description of how the work will deepen students' learning and accelerate student achievement in math and reading is missing. Also missing is a description of how the pieces of the plan are to be woven together into a coherent reform vision.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(A) (2)

Evidence in this section confirms:

1) The reform initiative for the consortium was developed to include all schools in the 14 districts.

2) The charts provide the list of the schools participating in the reform initiative and provide information about the total number/percentages of participating students from low income families and that are high need students. There is variability across some schools with the majority having high percentages of students from low income families.

In summary, the description provided in this section provides evidence about how the applicant selected its districts and schools within the districts for the consortium. The process described by the applicant shows evidence that careful attention was paid to districts with students that were not making annual progress, particularly students in different sub-groups such as ELL and minority students. The method used to select the districts and schools meets the eligibility requirements. The total number of participating students who are high need and from low income families and participating educators are provided. What is missing is carefully detailed description of how the applicant's approach to implementing the reform to the districts/schools in the consortium will be done. The vision supports the objectives of RTTD and many of the efforts the applicant will do as described as part of its vision and objectives are consistent with what is needed to move students forward so they are achieving at a level at least commensurate with where they need to be to graduate from high school and be ready for college or a career, but detailed information is missing in the description of the reform agenda to give confidence that this can be accomplished.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant did not provide specific narrative that described how the reform efforts would be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support districtwide change beyond the participating schools, there was information that did describe the objectives and activities for each of the four years of the plan, showing evidence of a scaling up effort from year 1 to 2 to 3 to 4 resulting in districtwide change, but it pertained to the participating schools only. In other words, there was evidence that within the participating schools scaling up efforts would occur from year 1 to year 2 to year 3 to year 4. The vision framework (A.iii Vision Framework) does illustrate the building blocks that begin with changes in curriculum, policy, data, and technology and culminate in increased postsecondary workforce readiness, and the timeline (A.vi) does articulate when during the four years activities will commence, but the lack of specific detail about scaling up beyond the participating schools is missing in this section and must be inferred from information located in other sections and in the appendices (e.g., logic model). However, even in these sections, there is not explicit evidence that the word will expand beyond the grant years to other schools. In sum, this section gives one confidence that work will be completed within the identified schools but is lacking for how scaling up will occur beyond the participating schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A) (4) According to the notice, selection criteria (A) (4) a consortium applicant is to provide information for each LEA in a consortium. The application provides only overall data in its charts. The following information is only for OVERALL. The reduction in points is because some specific and required information for each each sub-group is missing, including data for certain grades. For example, data for each grade level assessment on the CSAP was missing. Data were also missing for each identified sub-group in some areas.

(a) The goals for elementary reading and middle school math are ambitious and reasonable. However, data at the high school level other than the ACT data are not provided for high school. The ACT in grades 11 and 12 measures students' academic readiness to make successful transitions to college and work after high school and are used in conjunction with the CO Student Assessment Program (CSAP), but data for grade 10 from the CSAP was not included. There is no narrative with this section.

- (b) The goals for reducing the achievement gap for the three sub-groups for elementary reading and middle school math are modest and given the information in section (A) (1), they appear to be reasonable. However, without narrative, which would explain how the goals would be achieved, it can only be inferred from earlier sections that they are attainable. Information for high schools is not included.
- (c) The goals for increasing the graduation rate for each identified sub-group are ambitious, yet achievable.
- (d) The goals for college enrollment are modest, yet achievable, however data are provided for only the minority sub-group, and not the ELL and FRL sub-group.
- (e) Post-secondary degree attainment: Data are provided for each LEA in this section, however disaggregated data by sub-group are missing. The goals are modest.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B) (1)</p> <p>The application provides some information on the progress that individual LEAs have made within some of its schools to demonstrate the effects of grants it has received in different areas such as math and for different grade levels such as middle schools, but the information is not consistent and across all of the schools within an LEA or even for all of the LEAs in the consortium. For example, there are 17 LEAs in the consortium and the narrative speaks to only 7 LEAs and the information is scant with regard to documenting change over the past four year period. There are charts in the Appendices but they are for only a very small number of specific schools within some of the LEAS.</p> <p>There are no details about the reform effort that demonstrate the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools within each of the LEAs. Nor is there uniform (for each LEA) information about making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents. There is some information about what is going on in districts in this region of the state in terms of data access, e.g., how teachers meet in teams in some areas to review data and use the data to make decisions, and how information is used during parent-teacher conferences, and some LEAs are showcased with what they are doing with program elements (e.g., Sanford SD implementing a one-to-one lap top program), but information about the conditions for reform needed for this section are inconsistent and insufficient.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B) (2)</p> <p>This section asked the extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments by making public expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. None of this information is in this section and only overall project level information is available elsewhere in the application in budget descriptions. It is not possible to discern what the budgets would be at the school level because there is no salary information in the application and there is no information about non-personnel expenditures at the school level.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B) (3)</p> <p>There is evidence of some efforts within CO that strengthen the reforms the consortium will undertake:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) adoption and implementation of revised academic standards tied to the Common core Standards 2) adoption of a new assessment system that will signal mastery of standards at grade level and measure progress toward mastery 3) educator effectiveness legislation that is focused on student academic growth and designed to improve professional practice and inform hiring, promotion, compensation, and professional development decisions 		

- 4) implementation of a school and district accountability system (SB 09-163)
 - 5) requirements for individual career and academic plans
 - 6) passage of READ Act to address a gap in assessment prior to 3rd grade with a focus on literacy at the K-3 levels
 - 7) passage of charter schools law that place no limit on the number of charter schools and allow for multiple authorizers and appeal options (SB93-183 and SB 08-130)
 - 8) passage of the innovation schools act for schools to develop and implement innovative practices in a wide variety of areas for the purpose of improving student outcomes, and gives teachers and school leaders flexibility and autonomy to design schools to fit the needs of students.
- These are important indicators of what is in place and given that CO districts operate with a significant amount of of autonomy around the means by which to implement these reforms in individual schools it is presumed that the LEAs and its schools are able to implement the personalized learning environments that are central to the RTTD grant. However, this section required that each LEA demonstrate that it had the conditions within the LEA and sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environments and this information is missing. The information is not sufficient for concluding that the LEAs had conditions and autonomy to implement personalized learning environments.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B) (4)

The grant application was completed through a collaborative writing process that included face to face input regarding the creation of a high level vision for the consortium. The process involved all 14 school district Superintendents and the BOCES Executive director. Additionally, engagement in the development of plan specifics by many of the region's district and building level administrators, teachers, parents, and students was gained through participation in numerous strategic working groups. A thorough description of how these individuals were involved and how revisions were made based on their input was missing.

With regard to the requirement that there is evidence of direct engagement and support for proposals from teachers in collective bargaining LEAs, four of the 14 LEAs have collective bargaining agreements. According to the application, association membership and leadership were involved throughout the grant writing process and are committed to supporting the proposal as evidenced by the signature of the union president in each MoU.

With regard to the requirement for LEAs without collective bargaining agreements that at a minimum at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal this is not as clear. The requirements is that 70% form each participating school support the initiative and there are no data to that effect. However, the applicant reports that over 400 teachers participated in an organized project overview and feedback session where a summary of the grant was shared. This effort included more than 90 percent of the teachers who were not part of LEAs with collective bargaining agreements. During the session teachers responded to a survey about the overall grant plan. Responses were positive and a large percentage of respondents supported different elements of the overall plan. However, only 204 responses to the survey were tabulated, resulting in a 51% response rate and it is not known what schools they represented and of the schools whether 70% supported the initiative from each school. Thus it is not possible to determine what percentage of this percentage were teachers in non-collective bargaining LEAs. and what schools they represented and what schools they came from. Thus there is no evidence that at least 70% of the teachers from participating schools within LEAs without collective bargaining agreements support the proposal.

There are Letters of Support from a broad constituency.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

(B) (5) This section was to report on the extent to which each LEA demonstrated evidence of a high quality plan that would make it possible to assess the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. The applicant reports very limited information and it is summary information. None of the information reports is by LEA so it is not possible to determine if there is a high quality plan for each LEA. The applicant reports overall information for the consortium such as the number of districts that had user friendly curriculum related to state standards in certain grades, the number of districts that have a majority of the its teachers currently teaching to specific learning objectives tied to state standards, the number of districts with teachers that currently measure student learning by administering daily formative assessments, the number of districts that reports that they currently have an evaluation process in place, and so on. The applicant states it will use this type of information to increase the number of districts so that 100% are using, for example, curriculum that is related to state standards, using daily assessments to inform instruction, and so on, but it is not possible to infer from any of the information provided in this section that each LEA is actively engaged in producing a high quality plan that includes all of the required elements. It is possible that the data collected on the status of each LEA will be used to produce a high quality plan in each LEA but information is missing for each LEA, particularly how the

LEA will proceed in the development of a high quality plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(C) (1)</p> <p>In order to accelerate student achievement the consortium is committed to providing personalized learning opportunities for all students, in which instructional methods, curriculum, and learning environments meet the needs and aspiration of individual learners. To do this, the applicant proposes several different reform efforts. Evidence provided in the application included the following:</p> <p><u>Student involvement and engagement in the learning process</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. adoption of a curriculum and a set of formative assessments that are aligned to Common Core Standards: the state-provided district sample curriculum will be collaboratively refined by consortium educators to ensure that the resulting curriculum maps are engaging a broad group of students, can be applied in a differentiated manner to individual students, and allow educators to have control over instruction methods and day to day pacing. 2. curriculum will be coupled with formative assessments and training for teachers in how to use assessments. 3. assessments will be tied to discrete learning targets and connected to a robust data system that will produce reports to teachers so they can know who needs re teaching, who is on track, and who needs an extension. Students can also use information to determine where they are in mastering skills and knowledge/their strengths and weaknesses. 4. standards-based grading which will measure students' proficiency on well-defined learning targets and not on seat time. Students will be taught how to self-assess and monitor their own progress toward long-term goals in their own Individualized Career and Academic Plan (ICAP), and how to use feedback. 5. students will have some flexibility in determining how they will demonstrate mastery. <p><u>Targeted Early Literacy Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. early literacy assessment will be given to 3 and 4 year old children to determine literacy readiness. Intervention will be tailored to needs of your children. This will be followed by a more personalized and responsive literacy program in grades K-5. One district's successful effort in this area will be used in other districts. 2. rotational blended learning modules will be implemented in grades K-5. Model allows the literacy block to be broken into three parts, and students into three small groups. Students will be able to work independently on a computer-based adaptive tool that provides them with practice that is tailored to them. Models build on success on one of the districts. <p><u>Personalized, adaptive instruction through blended learning</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To support the consortium's vision of college and career readiness, a mastery-based learning system will be developed and customized to meet the needs of students and implemented and available to students in an anytime, anywhere format. Platform will initially be used to implement blended learning models of instruction in K-5 literacy. At the middle school level a more flexible model will be used and delivered through a sophisticated learning platform and the focus will be on math. 2. Blended solutions will be introduced to improve writing at the middle and high school levels. 3. A one to one laptop program will be fully implemented for all students grades 6-12 across all 14 districts. <p><u>Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP)/Life Skills Curriculum</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consortium will use the CO state individual career and academic plan model as a framework through which school counselors can guide students through meaningful career planning. The model begins in middle school and continues to high school. 2. A customized web-based tool will be developed by school year 2013-2014 to provide students with a vehicle to participate in the ICAP journey. <p><u>Increased Access to advanced and specialized course content</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers identified as being highly effective throughout the consortium will be trained in the use of distance learning and will teach classes 		

of students, including those physically located at their own school and those who participate via distance learning systems from other schools throughout the consortium. The same approach will be used to provide access to postsecondary classes such as those offered by Colorado Mountain College's virtual campus. The first focus will be AP classes to high achieving students.

Summary: Insufficient information is provided within each area to satisfy the requirements in (a), (b), and (c). Goals, specific activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties have not been identified for each reform area. The strategies that have been identified are important, however they are not described in enough depth to illustrate how they would be implemented within each LEA and across all LEAs.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C) (2) The project will provide teachers with the tools, resources, training, and support they need to provide each student with appropriate instruction when it is needed and in a manner that is tailored to the needs of the student. The evidence provided includes:

Professional Development/Support/Training/Working Together

1. Five times a year all teachers in the consortium will come together as a community for a full day to receive training and share best practices in professional learning communities (PLCs) Twenty-eight PLCs across the consortium have been created to allow teachers and administrators to work with colleagues from relevant grade levels, academic subjects, and areas of expertise.
2. Intensive training sessions during the summer months on how to assess students' work and progress on a daily basis: how to provide clear, descriptive feedback, teach students how to use feedback, teach students how to self-assess and monitor their own progress.
3. Task forces will provide in-depth support to teachers in key areas of the grant: curriculum and formative assessments, standards- and competency-based grading, literacy intensive, blended learning, data system, technology infrastructure, and learning new life skills. Each task force will be comprised of 4 to 6 individuals with relevant expertise. Once each task force has completed its work, teachers and administrators will receive comprehensive professional development (e.g., on use of personalized learning platform and how to use data from the system to inform instruction and provide assistance to students)
4. Teachers will work together in curriculum teams to establish a common curriculum in all grade levels and subject areas that will result in monthly maps with clear learning targets and appropriate context for how objectives sequence and fit together. Teachers will also identify a set of common formative assessments aligned with the common curriculum.
5. Experienced external partners will be engaged to provide teachers, instructional coaches, as well as district and school leaders with tailored professional learning opportunities so they can support an effective, systemic approach to Common core Standards implementation.
6. Teachers will collaboratively analyze effectiveness of various instructional strategies.
7. Targeted professional development will be provided for school counselors and teaching staff in how to guide students through the Individual Career and Academic Plan Program (ICAP) process. Staff will be fully trained in how to navigate the site, guide students through the site, monitor their progress, and run data reports that will allow for personalized instruction.

Access to and information on how to use tools, data, and resources/Use of information

1. As noted in #3 above, as part of teachers' professional development training, they will have access to the platform that will be used and will have access to data they can use to help their students. Teachers will be able to see a list of their students who need attention; information will be based on student scores, self-assessments, and requests for help. Teachers will be able to monitor students' progress data regularly and use the information to intervene with students who are getting off track.
2. The personalized learning platform will be integrated with each district's current data system so that data currently collected can be integrated with new information and used by teachers.

Student Access to Effective Teaching

1. As noted in the professional development section above, teachers in the consortium will received training in areas related to the grant. Students will then have opportunity to receive instruction from these teachers. This includes the use of distance learning.

Teacher evaluation

1. By 2013-14 all districts will be fully implementing high quality principal and teacher quality standards and evaluation processes that are focused on student academic growth and designed to improve professional practice and inform hiring, promotion, compensation, and professional development decisions. At least 50% of the evaluation will be determined by students' academic growth.

The evidence provided in this section centers on important areas, however, the descriptions do not fully embrace what needed to be included: implementation of of instructional strategies for all participating students--including high-need students such as special education students

and ELL students and the lowest performing students such as minority students--that enable them to pursue a rigorous course of study that is aligned to college and career ready standards and college and career ready graduation requirements. Even though alignment with the Common Core Standards is evident, information was lacking as to how each district and the consortium as a whole will, for example, accelerate student learning so that all students will be able to make progress in meeting academic standards. The efforts planned are focused on the right areas but the descriptions fall short of providing convincing evidence that teaching and learning will sufficiently change in each district.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(D) (1) Overall, the application shows reasonable evidence of several practices and state policies and rules that could result in a personalized learning environment for students and meet the goals of the grant. The descriptions provided by the applicant about practices, policies, and rules that will facilitate personalized learning include explicit information in key areas: governance, flexibility and autonomy, multiple types of opportunities to demonstrate mastery of material, and adaptable and accessible resources. The state makes a lot of this possible because of its commitment to local control at the LEA level. The applicant provides evidence in each of the areas identified:</p> <p><u>Governance Structure</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each participating district signed an MoU that detailed its decision making responsibilities, organization and governance structure, and the terms and responsibilities that pertained to implementation of grant activities. 2. To ensure effective implementation and oversight of grant, a Personalized Learning Steering Committee (PLSC), an Executive Director and Program Officer will be hired, and several Project Task Forces will be established. The PLSC will provide oversight of implementation, monitor progress, and make course correction recommendations. Members will include 2 members of the Superintendents Advisory Council (SAC), 2 members of BOCES, 3 teachers, 3 content experts in personalized learning, technology, college and career readiness, and 3 community stakeholders. 3. Individuals identified in #2 above are tasked with making sure that support and services are provided to individual schools with in each LEA in the consortium although the section did not explain how this would be done at the LEA level. <p><u>Flexibility and Autonomy</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Districts operate with a great degree of autonomy. They determine their own calendars, bell schedules, and staffing models. Site-based budgeting is the norm. School leadership teams work collaboratively with district personnel to develop budgets that are aligned with instructional improvement needs in their buildings. Emergency certification and alternative licensing is provided when it is not possible to find a qualified teacher in a needed content areas. However, what is not clear is the degree of autonomy and control each LEA has to develop personalized learning for each student, including altering how instruction is delivered during a school day. LEAs with collective bargaining may not have this as a negotiable item. 2. When implementing the grant the governance structure of the consortium will support collaboration across its districts by sharing teachers, technology, and curriculum, including the use of virtual classrooms. <p><u>Mastery Learning/Multiple Opportunities to Demonstrate Mastery</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Every teacher in every school in the consortium uses Daily formative Assessments (DFAs) to measure individual student achievement of identified learning goals and objectives. 2. By the end of year 2 of the RTTD grant, standards-based grading will be in place for all grades in all schools in the consortium. By the end of year 4, a competency-based system will be in place for all high schools. <p><u>Adaptable and Accessible Resources</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All LEAs currently supplement their general curriculum with a variety of supports for special populations, primarily ELL and special education students. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

(D) (2) Overall, this section provides appropriate evidence of current and intended activities, however, information is not provided at the LEA level so it is not possible to know if the infrastructure within each LEA supports personalized learning. The applicant uses words like "the majority of districts" which makes awarding full points not possible since the requirement is at the LEA level. Many elements are currently in place in "the majority of districts" within the consortium, however there are some gaps. RTTD funding would be used in these areas.

Access to Necessary Content

1. A majority of the districts in the consortium already use desktop and laptop computers and Smartboards for instruction; some use tablets and response clickers as well. In addition, a variety of software technologies are in use.
2. Student Information Systems provide access for parents to their student's class schedules, homework assignments, and grades. Parents without Internet access use traditional approaches for interaction and meetings such as parent-teacher conferences. Many families do not have Internet access at home. A few districts bridge this gap by loading the school devices with information that can be taken home.
3. A large grant that will provide broadband services to educational entities was awarded to the state; it will allow EAGLE-Net to complete a sustainable middle mark network by 2013. This will ensure that all districts in the consortium will have access to the Internet by that time. Funds are budgeted for districts to improve their technology infrastructure to ensure that wide scale connectivity is possible.

Technical Support

1. All districts have one full or part-time technology expert. To ensure there is adequate support for the technology required an IT coordinator will be hired. The IT coordinator will provide the necessary training for staff, students, and parents to ensure optimal use of all technologies required.

Interoperable Data System

1. The SchoolView Data Center, an online warehouse managed by CDE and fully accessible by the public, provides comprehensive information about CO's schools and districts including federal and state accountability results, enrollment demographics, attendance and graduation rates, and the district or school's level of attainment on academic achievement and growth, closing achievement gaps, and postsecondary readiness.
2. To supplement School View, all districts in the consortium use a common system to track individual student demographic and performance data and to create individual student reports and improvement plans. This system, or one comparable to it, will be expanded to manage student achievement data and to generate relevant reports.
3. The consortium will also develop and implement its own Website specific to this grant to provide ongoing information to stakeholders. The website will provide public access to areas related to grant activities, including but not limited to student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(E) (1) The majority of the information in this section pertained to activities the state is currently involved in, activities that affect school districts and schools throughout the state. Activities/programs/models such as RTi were described but it was not clear if they have been adequate for the schools within each LEA to meet the needs of staff and students. With one exception (rTi), there was limited information about the strategies districts within the consortium would use for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. It appears that the rTi model will be the primary model used by districts. Under the grant, a full-time rTi specialist will be hired to provide hands-on support in years 1 and 2 of the grant and will assist with aligning the model with the goals of the grant and implementing it with fidelity for each district in the consortium. This does not seem adequate, especially given what is required to implement the model, specifically the goal to fully embed the system within each LEA across the Consortium. An additional RTi specialist will be hired but not until years 3 and 4. Findings from the rTi model will be reported regularly to the Executive Director, the Personalized Learning Steering Committee (PLSC), and the Superintendent Advisory Council (SAC). Findings will be used to make corrections in implementation.

The charts--pyramid overview and rubrics--in the Appendices illustrate the strategy for ensuring continuous improvement using the rTi model and are specific to school, leadership, and teacher. However, even though it is the model adopted by the state, it is not clear whether the state provides adequate technical support and training for all of its districts. With only one full-time person to be hired for the grant for all 14 districts and schools support does not seem adequate. Five districts are currently part of the state's initial rollout. Information is missing as to whether the "to be hired" RTi person will assist with a "scale up and out" to the remaining districts or whether the state will provide technical support and the grant hired person will work with the remaining districts and schools in years 1 and 2.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E) (2) The consortium has identified several different venues it will use to share information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consortium website (described in Section D2) will provide the primary communication vehicle for the grant. Regular updates will be posted on the website. In addition, Facebook and Twitter, and targeted e-mails will announce key events, share success stories, and solicit input on specific projects. 2. Paper reports for individuals not on the Internet will be available by individual districts, but it is not clear how frequently such reports will become available and how they will be disseminated to individuals. 3. Meetings will be held where information will be shared, including Town Hall meetings. 4. Newspaper and radio stations will also share news. 5. Electronic surveys will be also be administered and information from the surveys will be shared. <p>The biggest concern is that a key stakeholder group, parents, may not have access to the most current information about the project. Without Internet service and a computer in each home, it will be a challenge for parents to keep apprised of what is going on within the project at each school and across schools within a district.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E) (3)</p> <p><u>Rationale provided for selection of measures</u></p> <p>1. Superintendents selected the measures using data from performance framework reports on academic achievement, growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Forecasts were projects based on probable baseline data (using multiple measures already in place). Social, emotional, and wellness data were also selected to focus on risk factors that are known to limit student progress, including student engagement, mental health, and substance abuse metrics. Attendance rates are also included.</p> <p>The rationale for selecting each measure is appropriate.</p> <p><u>How measures will be tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern and measure success over time</u></p> <p>1. The applicant did not go into detail about how the measures would be used by each LEA within the consortium and, importantly, how all of the data would be used at the school level to measure progress. Given that each district will be using the rTi model, information was needed on how data from each of the measures would be integrated in the model, particularly how it would be used to identify where interventions are needed and how progress will be identified using specific data from each measure or integrated across measures as in a composite risk indicator.</p> <p>The applicant does have the requisite number of performance measures identified.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E) (4) The PLSC, the ED, and relevant project Task forces will use the rTi process to continuously monitor progress on the performance measures. However, as noted in the discussion for (E) (3) it is not clear how all of the performance measure data will be used within the rTi model. An external evaluator will be hired to evaluate key areas of implementation such as professional development, creation, adoption, and refinement of curriculum aligned to Common Core Standards, modifications made within schools related to project goals, stakeholder engagement, and so forth. The evaluation system is designed to provide the necessary accountability to the public. Progress reports will be issued twice each year and will be made available on the consortium web site and in hard copy.</p> <p>Additional information on what data will be collected for each of the areas identified, how often the data will be collected and from whom, and how information will be used along with the performance measure data to evaluate change over time at the consortium and the LEA levels was lacking.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(F) (1) It was challenging to locate the information to satisfy the requirements for this section because the budget tables were not identified in the Table of Contents and did not follow the narrative for F1. The funds to be used for the project are justified, however, as noted in an earlier discussion, there is concern that hiring just one person to oversee the rTi implementation in LEAs and schools across the project is likely not adequate. RtI is the model the project is using and linked to the model is the technology that will be used during implementation of the project, particularly the use of data from all of the performance measures/indicators to inform practice and to communicate to stakeholders within schools (principals, teachers) and outside of schools (e.g., parents) and district personnel. Even though an external evaluator will be used and money is allocated for this position, the role of the rTi person is central and critical to the success of the project. Hence it does not seem that adequate resources have been allocated because the intention is to hire just one rTi person to oversee the successful implementation of the rTi model.</p> <p>Funds to be used as one time investments seem reasonable.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(F) (2) The narrative provided by the applicant for this section emphasizes that the project and its activities are geared to implementation during its four year period. The bulk of expenses are one time expenses. The applicant acknowledges that given how money will be spent and on what specific activities and technology, the impact will extend beyond the four year period. There are post-grant goals for each school for the principal and teacher and the rubric for rTi implementation has a column labeled "Optimizing: Innovating and Sustainability" with information about what districts will do. But sustainability of project requires more than this. It requires detail on how grant activities will be extended beyond the life of the grant and what resources will be brought to bear on the years beyond the grant. There is no specific information about how the project will be sustained over time. The budget is for the current grant period and the use of funds is for the grant period only. Because some information is provided a partial award of points is provided.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application describes partnerships that will support the objectives of the project. The partnerships were established to promote early literacy and pre-academic skills, as well as health and wellness throughout the region. The information provided for each partnership is variable with some narratives providing indicators with measures so it is possible to anticipate how individual students would be affected through the delivery of partnership components (e.g., AIM) and minimal or vague descriptions of other partnerships. Indeed, with the exception of the AIM and HELM partnerships, it is not clear exactly what data would be gathered and used to determine the effectiveness of a partnership. Also missing was information about how a partnership would develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students and communities in LEAs where they currently exist or the consortium as a whole over time and information about how the partnerships and individual LEAs or the consortium as a whole would build build the capacity of staff in participating schools.</p> <p>The narrative does identify 8 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While the application holds some promise for moving students toward achieving important academic and behavioral goals, and state policies are in place to support practices and processes, the application lacked comprehensiveness and coherence. Project activities in some areas have been in place as a result of state policies in CO and as a result of CO's RTT grant, but the new projects that have been designed do not appear to strategically build on existing practices in ways that will decisively improve learning and teaching so that students can make the progress needed to graduate from high school ready for college or a career. There was insufficient evidence that the projects would deepen student learning, increase the effectiveness of teachers, expand student access to the most effective teachers, decrease achievement gaps across student groups, and increase the rates at which students would graduate from high school prepared for college.

Total	210	106
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0923CO-3 for Center Consolidated School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley Consortium presents a vision to develop personalized learning experiences for all students in the consortium. The goal is to build students' abilities to help them become more self-motivated and assume ownership of their own learning. All teachers in the consortium will be trained to support the vision and the vision is to be able to share highly effective teachers across all the districts.

A concept overview for the consortium of 48 schools includes a foundation of curriculum, policy, data, and technology undergirding leadership and instructional staff development and purposeful parent engagement. Getting to the goal of increased postsecondary workforce development, four areas move from a core early literacy development, to a student driven mastery based sequence, to a student driven exploration of postsecondary options, to a focused learning for postsecondary success. Individualized career academic plans would be developed in middle school and continue to be developed in more depth through high school.

Vision lacks specifics for the focus on literacy intervention in grade K-5 and the math master sequence for grades 6-8. The concept overview needs more description and explanation. The vision is not presented in a coherent way. It needs more description and detail.

Score low medium

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley Consortium proposes to work with all 48 schools in the 14 districts. The schools vary widely in size and are spread across a large geographic area. A list of all schools is provided with the total number of participating students in each school, number of participating students from low income families, number of participating students with high needs, and participating educators in each school.

With small individual student populations and single-digit high school graduating classes in some schools, the program of personalized learning will be rolled out to schools over the period of the proposal. A strong focus on literacy, with emphasis on early readiness and literacy intervention for grades K-5, will be implemented early in the grant years.

During the first year a customized web-based tool will be developed to meet the needs of each district. The tool will be rolled out to all high schools and piloted at the middle level schools that have adequate counselor capacity.

By the second year, building off the focus on literacy at the elementary school level, a rotational blended model will be established for K-5 literacy instruction throughout the Valley K-5 schools. Mathematics for grades 6-8 will be implemented through a platform-driven model of blended learning grades 6-8 schools. Prior to implementing blended learning across the schools, it will be piloted for chosen subjects and grade bands in the summer of 2014.

All high schools will implement a competency-based system in 2014-15.

The plan to roll out across the schools after pilot programs have implemented is a good plan.

The way schools are selected for the pilots and then for rollout would be strengthened with more detail and make the school selection transparent.

Score low high

.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley Consortium proposes to work with all 48 schools across the 14 districts in the consortium so it begins with a scaled-up model that supports district wide change. Because of the small size of each of the districts, implementation across the Consortium provides the necessary scale to support all students and is cost effective, efficient and uses strengths of individual districts.

The framework for personalized learning will be rolled out over several years with a different focus at each school level. The first year will lay the foundation for future work including: technology and infrastructure support to support blended and distance learning opportunities; a system to provide timely, relevant data to support individualization for students both in academics and interests; organizational capacity and policies to support implementation across the Consortium; and a Common Core Standards aligned and viable curriculum used across the Consortium.

First year of grant:

- all school outfitted with technology to support increased use of digital technology in classrooms
- improvement of data systems to organize data from multiple formative assessments and to support blended learning platform
- organizational and management structure put in place, hiring Executive Director and Program Officer, establishing a Personalized Steering Committee and Project Task Forces

Educators will use formative assessments to drive content of small group instruction and provide personalized learning based on student progress. Teachers will be trained in techniques to help students make self-assessments and track progress.

Sample curriculum being developed at the state level that is aligned to the Common Core Standards will be refined along with identifying formative assessments. All teachers will be trained to use the assessments. Elementary teachers will be trained on literacy assessment and intervention strategies to respond to individual student needs in year 2013-14. The Consortium will also invest in deep training for teachers in student-involved assessment.

The 2013-14 school year is ambitious with the rollout of the curriculum, formative assessments and student-involved assessment directly impacting all the students in the Consortium. In addition, middle and high school counselors will be trained in the initial rollout of a 9-12 curriculum to assist students in exploring postsecondary options for creating Individual Career and Academics Plans (ICAPs). ICAPs help students explore options available for careers, align curriculum course work, apply to postsecondary institutions, secure financial aid and ultimately enter the workforce. A customized web-based tool will be developed to meet the needs of each district. The first year the tool will be used in all high schools and piloted in middle schools. School administrators will reach out to parents to explain the implications and the benefits of the changes.

By 2014-15, the Consortium will be ready to implement blended learning in key subjects and grade bands. A blended learning model for literacy instruction will be established for K-5 literacy instruction throughout the Consortium. In addition a platform driven model of blended learning will be implemented to personalize learning in mathematics grades 6-8. Before introducing blended learning in a comprehensive way, this form of instruction will be piloted in summer 2014. After the initial year of implementation, evaluation, and refinements, blended learning opportunities for both mathematics and ELA will be expanded for all grades in 2015-16. Beginning in 2014-15 distance learning

opportunities will begin with Iwo Advanced Placement classes. Based on input from students and parents, two additional courses will be offered each year.

Plan is ambitious and high-quality.

Score high

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Performance for all students in the Consortium and for student subgroups in elementary school reading and middle school math is presented in a table. The table identifies subgroups of English Language Learners, Minority, and Free and Reduced Lunch. Included is baseline data for two years (2010-11 and 2011-12) followed by Goals for four years of the grant and one year post-grant (2016-17). Data is percent of students proficient/advanced.

Decreasing achievement gaps is presented for students overall and the subgroups of English Language Learners, Minority, and Free and Reduced Lunch for the content areas of elementary school reading and middle school math. Data is median growth in percent for two baseline years, four years of grant and one year post-grant using same years as above.

Graduation rates in percent are presented for overall and subgroups of English Language Learners, Minority, and Free and Reduced Lunch for baseline year 2010-11, (2011-12 not available at time of submission), four years of grant and one year post-grant.

College enrollment is presented as percentage for overall and minority subgroup with baseline data for 2009-10, the four years of the grant and one post-grant year.

Postsecondary degree attainment presented for First Year Retention as a percentage for overall student group with baseline for two years(2009-10 and 2011-12 not yet published) and for four years of grant and one year post-grant.

It is not clear if the data presented exceed or are equal to State ESEA targets. The data presented would be strengthened by narrative and also if numbers of students in each overall and subgroup were presented.

Score medium

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Center Consolidated School District was selected to serve as the lead LEA for the Consortium (San Luis Valley) because of its success in the implementation of a federal School Improvement Grant in Haskin Elementary School. Experiences have been shared district-wide to scale up learnings from the grant at middle and high school levels. Center's achievements are impressive because of its challenged student population: over 90% eligible for FRL, over 90% minority, 50% ELL, and the highest migrant population in San Luis Valley with approximately 30% of students qualifying for federal migrant education services.

The results at Haskin for third graders was an increase from 28% proficiency/advanced in 2010 to a 76% proficiency/advanced in 2012 as measured by state tests. Percentile growth in reading surpassed state average jumping from 36 to 53 percent. At no additional cost the training initiatives were successfully duplicated at the middle and high schools. Through this transformation process educators and students partnered to implement:

- a one-on-one laptop program
- programs to raise the culture of expectation for academic effort and behavior
- curriculum aligned to Common Core Standards
- creative and engaging teaching methods
- personalized learning strategies in many subjects
- focused professional development efforts

These efforts translated into impressive achievements in upper grades. Examples include:

- middle school achieved greater than 50th percentile median growth in all tested categories in 2010-2011. All tested categories in 2012 increased to 60th percentile growth
- high school now averaging 50th percentile growth in all tested areas
- dropout rates declined from 12 percent to 2 per cent resulting in an over 90% graduation rate
- college credits earned by students in high school increased from 0 in 2005 to 200 per year
- 2011-12 data show that more than 70% of Center High School graduates now attend postsecondary educational institutions after graduation compared to 20% in 2004-05

Risk factors have also shown dramatic changes:

- alcohol use by students dropped from 55 to 25 percent
- marijuana use dropped from 21 to 11 percent
- use of cigarettes dropped from 28 to 10 percent
- chewing tobacco use dropped from 15 percent to negligible

There is a record of success across the valley as districts have begun to incorporate personalized learning strategies:

- Del Norte Middle School growth in grades 6-8 over three years went from 74 percent to 79.6 percent
- Moffat Consolidated School District #2 recognized as Accredited with Distinction for two consecutive year
- since 2009 students attending Monte Vista On-Line Academy have shown consistent growth on state standardized assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics
- Metz Elementary School 60% students with IEPs achieved high growth in reading and 69% of ELL students achieved "typical" or "high growth" in writing while 66% of IEP students achieved "typical" or "high growth" in writing (Growth categories established and assigned Colorado Statewide Performance Framework).
- students at Centauri High School have shown consistent growth on ACT scores, for example math scores increased from 17.7 in 2008 to 21.1 in 2012 exceeding state average
- Sargent's eighth grade students have consistently performed above state average in state's standardized science assessment

Districts across the San Luis Valley collect student achievement data in the form of quarterly summative assessments for Common Core, reading, ACT, etc. Data is available to teachers through Alpine and SchoolView Reports. Data guides decisions about student placement and services. Students meet regularly with teachers and administrators to discuss level of achievement and set goals. Data is shared with parent during conferences and parents are given passwords to access the district's information management system. School and district student achievement results are on SchoolView Website published by state.

For the schools presented in this section, there is a clear record of success, but the schools represent only some of the schools in the consortium. To demonstrate a more robust record of success, more schools and their data need to be presented.

Score medium

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All school districts signing on to the proposal annually report all school-level instructional and support staff qualifications, experience, and salary levels to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), focused on meeting NCLB requirements. Districts report actual personnel salaries at school level for instructional staff only, teachers only, and non-personnel expenditures at school level. CDE submits this information to the U.S. Census Bureau. Also much of the information is available on CDE 's website.

District budgeted and actual expenditures, including school level, are reported annually and monthly on district websites. Information is shared with public through a Consortium-wide website.

Board of Education budget hearings are open to the public and all personnel salaries and administrator salaries are approved by the Board of Education as action items during meetings and published in official minutes subsequently posted to the district website.

The minimum standards have been met for this section. More detail for processes, practices and investments for actual expenditures for pupil support, school administration, and instructional support would strengthen this presentation.

Score high middle.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Colorado has set a statewide vision for college and career readiness through legislation and shared definitions. For example Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness set in motion major efforts in the revised academic standards to implement Common Core Standards, the adoption of a new assessment system to measure mastery and progress toward the skills required to demonstrate college and career readiness. The READ Act addresses the gap in assessment prior to grade 3 by focusing on K-3 literacy, assessment, and individual plans for students identified as having significant reading deficiency. Colorado also is in the process of revisiting graduation guidelines moving away from seat time to a competency-based system statewide.

Colorado is a "local control" state so that school districts have a significant amount of autonomy in implementing reforms in their schools. Many public education decisions are made by school district administration and school boards; including such decisions as curriculum, personnel, school calendars, graduation requirements, and classroom policy. The Innovation Schools Act of 2008 provides a pathway for schools to develop and plan practices for improving student outcomes giving teachers and school leaders flexibility and autonomy to design schools to fit student needs.

The Colorado Department of Education supports districts in providing tools to ensure more frequent and reliable student information which can be used to support personalized learning. Systems to support districts through proving curriculum, assessments, professional development and technical assistance are provided by CDE and partnerships that it forms with stakeholders. Funding opportunities are provided to districts to support development of more personalized learning for students.

Colorado is viewed as model for rethinking education for students and providing an environment of autonomy, accountability and support to schools and districts.

There are mechanisms in place that provide successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regularity requirements to implement personalized learning environment.

Score high

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Meaningful stakeholder support for the development of the proposal was accomplished through a variety of strategies including in-person meetings between superintendents and the BOCES Executive Director, engaging region's district and building level administrators, teachers, parents and students in working groups conducted from September 24th through October 5th. Four of the fourteen districts involved in the

Consortium have collective bargaining agreements and have signed off on the Consortium MOU.

Over 400 teachers also participated in an organized project overview and feedback session. Over 90% of teachers not in a collective bargaining unit were participants. Teachers were able to ask questions and participate in small groups. A survey administered at the end of session with 204 responding had following results:

- 93% of teachers agreed foundational work targeted in grant is what we should be doing
- 85% agree that Core Early Literacy Intensive with goal of getting as many students to grade level reading is right work for ages three to eleven
- 90% of teachers support concept of transitioning to mastery-based instruction for middle school students in some subjects assuming teachers receive training and have technology equipment and infrastructure in place
- 96% of teachers support concept of using grant funds to personalize learning by educating middle and high school students on postsecondary options and allowing them to explore interests prior to graduation

Specific ideas were offered by teachers such as:

- more training in use of technology
- providing incentives for students for their achievements
- focus on parent and family engagement
- thoughtful addressing needs of special education students
- more funding for support staff to implement the PK-5 literacy intensive
- balance student driven and guided learning approaches
- support teachers towards directing instruction at higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy
- expand career instruction through whole consortium
- plan for what will happen to students not achieving mastery in a reasonable amount of time

Boards of Education were engaged in multiple districts' school board meetings. All San Luis Valley school district boards of education held public hearings inviting and acting on comments and suggestions from students, parents, business interests, and community members between October 15th and October 26th.

In addition to providing 10 days for comments from mayors and state officials, the application was available to the community through the Consortium's website for community and parent comment.

Letters of support from stakeholders are included in the Appendix and include letters from community partners, businesses, colleges and universities, US senators, Colorado's Governor, and Colorado Education Association.

While support from teachers was obtained through the MOUs from 4 of the 14 districts involved in the Consortium and 400 teachers participated in an organized project overview and feedback session, it is not clear how many of the teachers not in a bargaining unit support the project.

Score medium

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium conducted several needs assessments while preparing the proposal. A survey in June 2012 focused on curriculum, instruction, assessment and evaluation of Consortium's preparedness to measure and instruct students in a personalized learning environment. In October 2012 an assessment focused on district capability in technology and providing a blended personalized learning environment. Most districts reported the need for more work in curriculum, instruction, teacher professional development, evaluation and assessment.

Sample responses include:

- 3 of 15 districts/organizations reported they have an effective, user-friendly curriculum tied to state standards in grades 9-12
- 10 of 15 districts/organizations reported that the majority of their teachers currently teach to specific learning objectives tied to their curriculum or state standards on a daily basis
- 5 of 15 districts/organizations reported that the majority of their teachers currently measure student learning of objectives by administering daily formative assessments on a daily basis
- 1 of 15 district/organization leaders reported that they currently have a way of to tie student performance to their teacher evaluation process

- 8 of 15 district/organizations reported that their teachers currently consistently meet in Professional Learning Communities to discuss teaching strategies and student performance

The Consortium will address the needs identified such as a viable curriculum for all grade levels in all subject areas tied to Colorado and Common Core Standards. The curriculum will be piloted in spring 2013 and be fully in place in fall 2013.

The Consortium is also in process of support teachers in planning for and instructing high quality objectives and measuring student learning via daily formative assessments.

The Consortium is also supporting the implementation of state's new educator effectiveness law that requires teachers and principals to be evaluated based on a set of state adopted standards and student achievement results. A pilot program was conducted in three districts during 2011-12. Full implementation will occur in 2012-14. The full implementation will benefit from lessons learned from the pilots.

The Consortium grant has a goal of developing or purchasing formative assessments to be used to measure student learning on new curriculum. Also the Consortium's grant provides for the installation of technology broadband access, infrastructure, and purchase of one-on-one devices to provide expanded personalized blended learning opportunities through technology.

The plan lacks some specifics in terms of goals, tied to activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. These specifics would better support the analysis of need and gaps.

Score medium

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The San Luis Valley (SLV) Consortium is committed to providing personalized learning environments to all student to help them become owners of their own education. Support will be provided to teachers including the informed use of technology to ensure that they know students and families well and act on information to differentiate learning experiences based on student needs. The proposal includes reforms aimed at: involving and engaging students with the learning process; providing targeted early literacy support to meet the needs of diverse students; implementing blended learning to allow students to progress at their own pace and receive instruction best suited to how they learn best; and allowing students to explore and pursue a range of postsecondary options through a Life Skills curriculum and access a broader range of specialized courses in high school.

To have student involvement and engagement with the learning process the Consortium will first adopt a curriculum and set of formative assessments aligned to Common Core Standards. SLV educators will refine the state-provided District sample Curriculum into units of study to ensure that the curriculum can be applied in a differentiated manner for individual students. The curriculum will be coupled with quality assessments and training for teachers in the use of assessments. The assessments will be connected to discrete learning targets and to a robust data system so that teachers can quickly access reports for each target: who needs reteaching, who is on track, and who needs extension. The data system will provide the basis for deep learning conversations with students, help students assess their own progress and advocate for what they need and ultimately make good college and career choices.

The formative assessments will help teachers work with students to help them understand how they learn and move to understanding their learning strengths, style and effort linked to their personal goals and progress over time. The standards-based grading which measures students' proficiency on well-defined learning targets will provide clear feedback to students and families. They will know if the student met the target, exceeded the target or fell short.

By 2015-16 all students in grades 9-12 will demonstrate achievement of graduation requirements based on mastery of content rather than age or seat time. The students will some flexibility in how they demonstrate mastery which may also vary by subject matter.

The SLV Consortium has set a vision aligned with Colorado's READ Act that begins with quality early school and literacy assessment to identify which 3 and 4 year old children are coming to kindergarten already at risk and includes stronger pre-school intervention to provide pre-school students with direct intervention and support parents in developing literacy skills with their children. This will be followed by a more personalized and responsive literacy program grades K-5 to ensure each child's unique literacy needs are met and that they are strong academic readers and writers before moving on to middle school. Center School District has already successfully piloted this program and SLV seeks to expand this successful proven program to all districts.

Another strategy to increase personalized learning in literacy in grades K-5 will be the implementation of a rotational blended learning model. The model allows the literacy block to be broken into three parts and the students into three small groups. All students receive instruction from a teacher and guided practice in small groups, get to work independently on a computer-based adaptive tool, and then get the chance for

targeted intervention or extension.

To support SLV's vision of college and career readiness, the Consortium seeks to develop a personalized, mastery-based learning system that engages and empowers all learners, particularly those in poverty, in an age appropriate manner through blended learning. The Consortium will select a vendor able to offer a web-based teaching and learning platform that is available to students anytime and anywhere.

The platform will initially be used in the blended learning models for K-5 literacy instruction. At the middle school level a more flexible model will be used. Initially the focus will be mathematics in grades 6-8. This is an area in which the Consortium seeks significant improvement. Students will move on an individually customized schedule among learning modalities while teachers provide face-to-face support as needed such as in small groups, group projects, individual learning. The self-paced nature of the mastery-based approach will allow students to be successful in their own time.

The blended programming model will roll to K-5 mathematics in 2015-16. The blended learning in mathematics will also be introduced in high school. The blended learning model will also be introduced to improve writing instruction. The learnings gained from the blended learning models from both the K-5 literacy experience and the middle school mathematics experience will have a broad impact across the districts.

To support the initiative, a one-on-one laptop program will be implemented for all students in grades 6-12 across all 14 districts to ensure all students have access to a personal computing device including necessary software. This will put all districts on the same footing and support digital learning opportunities for students to prepare them for a technology driven world.

SLV Consortium will use the Colorado state Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP) model as framework for helping counselors guide students through meaningful career planning. The ICAP process begins with awareness activities in middle school and connecting course work to career goals. High school students continue the journey by engaging in self-awareness activities including personal interest, aptitude assessments, and career and educational goal setting. Job shadowing and internship opportunities are available for students. Senior year involves finalizing plans including applying for college admission and Free Application for Federal Student Aid.

In collaboration with a nonprofit established by the Department of Higher Education, a customized web-based tool will be developed by 2013-14 to provide students with a vehicle to participate in the ICAP journey. Career guidance activities will be customized for SLV Consortium.

Since SLV is made up of many small districts, the ability to offer advanced courses is limited and at times impossible. To provide opportunities for students to explore their expressed postsecondary paths, SLV Consortium proposes a model in which remotely-located teachers provide instruction in select subjects, interact directly with students, though not in person, and are fully responsible for student learning in designated subjects. Teachers identified as highly effective throughout the Consortium will be trained in the use of distance learning and will teach students in their own school and those who participate in distance learning. This distance learning approach can also provide students access to college classes. Students will be able to alternate between learning with remotely located teachers and digital learning. This approach will provide students with highly personalized learning experiences.

First focus of such an approach will be the Advanced Placement courses to high achieving students. As this model is implemented it will help provide a testing ground for later implementation with students of all ability levels.

The plan presents a model that will be or has been tested in some schools in the consortium and gradually rolls out from pilots in literacy in grades K-5 and mathematics in grades 6-8. Teachers are provided training but it is not described in depth. An effort is made to accommodate the range of schools, some of which have very small enrollments. To be a high-quality plan more specifics for teacher training, more description of the curriculum and particularly the assessments would make this much stronger presentation. How effective teachers are identified and trained in distance learning would add to the quality of the description.

Score high medium.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

SLV Consortium already has in place Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that provide teachers with a team of job-alike colleagues with whom to work and develop their instructional skills. There are 28 separate PLCs. Five times a year all the teachers come together as a community for a full day to receive training and share best practices. The PLCs have worked on learning how to write clear daily learning targets, share them with students, and use daily formative assessment for students to determine which students have reached target and which students need more work.

Targeted intensive training in the summer provides training in key components for personalized learning focused on helping students use feedback to self-assess and monitor their own progress.

Task forces comprised of 4-6 individuals with relevant expertise will be formed. Teachers and administrators will participate in these Task Forces which will focus on key areas of the grant: curriculum and formative assessment; standards-and-competency-based grading; literacy intensive; blended learning; data systems; technology infrastructure; and learning and life skills.

Teachers in the SLV Consortium will work in curriculum teams to refine state sample curriculum to align with local resources and context. This will be the first time the Consortium has a common curriculum. The curriculum will be ready for use in 2013-14 school year. The curriculum work will include the identification a set of common formative assessments to provide teachers and students quality monitoring and diagnostic information.

Experienced external partners will provide teachers, instructional coaches, as well as district leaders, tailored professional development for implementation and assessment of instruction. Standards-based grading will be implemented for all students in 2014-15. Students and families will have the opportunity to learn to read standards-based reports. External experts will help teachers implement standards-based grading and support the structures to help administrators implement the practice school-wide.

A Blended Learning Task Force will be formed to investigate tools and platforms for use in each of the blended learning applications in this plan. Once a learning platform vendor is selected, teachers and school leaders will receive comprehensive professional development on use of the personalized learning platform. Training will include onsite train-the-trainer, web-based videos hosted on the platform, custom online courses, phone training and phone support. The personalized learning platform is a big step to proving the information, tools, and data that teachers need to fully implement personalized learning and meet the students needs where they are in their learning.

The Individual Career and Academic Plan Program (ICAP) is a customized web-based tool to provide teachers and school counselors reports about their district. ICAP allows teachers to better know their students enabling them to identify student preferences, needs, and abilities to enhance personalized learning. At the high school level there will be one counselor per school to implement the program and at the middle school teachers will receive support to deliver the ICAP program to students. Targeted professional development will be provided by the developer of the ICAP for teachers and counselors so that they can navigate the site, guide students through the site, monitor their progress and run data reports to support personalized instruction.

The SLV Consortium will ensure that an increasing number of students receive instruction from highly effective teachers through the training of of excellent teachers who will provide instruction in select subjects across the consortium as well as the use of distance learning to connect students who are outside the SLV school districts.

By 2013-2014 all districts will be fully implementing high quality principal and teacher quality standards and evaluation processes aligned to Colorado's Educator Effectiveness Bill. The evaluation is focused on student growth and designed to improve professional practice and inform hiring, promotion, compensation and professional development. At least 50% of the evaluation must be determined by the academic growth of the teacher's students. Three districts in the San Luis Valley piloted the new Colorado Model Educator Effectiveness program in 2011-13. The pilot is providing valuable feedback, suggesting strengths and weaknesses and identifying challenges and strengths of the system. Another pilot in the district is doing an integration model: Colorado Academic Standards and aligned instructional materials to guide instruction; professional development in formative practices to inform instruction; and regular performance evaluations that hold educators accountable for student growth and provide the feedback to improve instruction.

The plan presented provides information about professional development for educators and how teachers will work in teams to support students. More description about professional development for schools leaders would strengthen this section. The information about data tools is sketchy. The pilot programs for evaluating teachers is limited in its description. The plan does not provide enough evidence that it can be successfully implemented.

Score medium

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The SLV Consortium has practices, policies and rules that facilitate personalized learning by the following:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> each of the 14 participating school districts is a member of the SLV BOCES established in 1966 each superintendent and the executive director of the BOCES serves on the Superintendents Advisory Council (SAC) SLV districts participate in a collaborative working groups to develop curriculum aligned to standards 		

- use professional learning communities to improve instruction

The Center Consolidated District will serve as the lead LEA and fiscal agent for grant. All districts have signed on in an MOU detailing purpose, organization and governance structure and terms of responsibility.

Personalized Learning Steering Committee (PLSC) will be formed, an Executive Director and Program Officer will be hired and Project Task Forces established. The PLSC will provide oversight of implementation, monitor progress and make course-correction recommendations to the SAC. Membership on the PLSC is defined and includes superintendents, teachers, content experts in personalized learning, technology, college and career readiness, community stakeholders (parents, business leaders, education reform organizations).

The PLSC will recruit and retain the Executive Director (ED) who will oversee implementation of funded projects, develop detailed action plans, monitor progress and make recommendations for changes. The ED will be responsible for communicating the vision of the grant to the community at large and serve as the public face of the program. The ED will recruit, retain and supervise the Program Officer to manage the budget, prepare and submit reports and provide hands-on support to LEAs as they implement projects.

Districts in SLV operate with a great deal of autonomy. They also cooperate with each other to support and hire personnel. Since many of the districts are quite small with only one or two schools there is a great deal of collaboration and sharing in both academic courses and instructional practices. The grant will likely increase and strengthen these collaborations.

SLV districts already employ elements of mastery learning. Every teacher uses Daily Formative Assessments to measure student achievement based on learning goals and objective. Programs that support students at risk of dropping out are; Ombudsman, Delta Center Online, the Academy Recovery Center, Heartlight, and Colorado Online Learning. By the end of year 2 of the RTT-D grant, a competency-based program will be in place for all high school students.

All SLV districts use the Daily Formative Assessments to measure student performance on a daily basis and adjust instruction based on results. In addition most districts use the Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress. These computerized adaptive assessments provide a wealth of data to inform instruction in real time. Students have many opportunities to demonstrate mastery.

SLV districts supplement their general curriculum with a variety of supports for special populations, primarily English Language Learners and special education students. BOCES maintains a data warehouse, Enrich, specifically devoted to managing individual education plans. The grant will ensure all students will benefit from individualized, personalized learning.

The proposal does not sufficiently address how school leadership teams will have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school level budgets.

Score medium

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium and school infrastructure supports personalized learning through:

- most districts report use of desk and laptop computers and Smartboards for instruction
- a variety of software technologies that are used such as Compass Learning, Kahn Academy, Online Encyclopedias and Dictionaries, Study Island, Read 180, NetTrekker Discovery Education and Brain Pop
- student information systems such as Go.edustar, Infinite Compass and Power School provide access to parents about their child's class schedules, homework, assignments and grade
- face-to-face conferences between parents and teachers
- Internet hotspots in many communities for parents without internet access
- creative ways to support parents without internet access by allowing students to take home wireless devices

A multi-million dollar Broadband Technology Opportunities Program infrastructure grant in 2010 will create a sustainable statewide middle mile network by August 31, 2013. All districts will have access to Internet by that time. However, districts will need to improve their technology infrastructure to take full advantage. Grant funds are budgeted to address these needs in districts schools.

An IT Coordinator will be hired to ensure that network, hardware, and software requirements are met in a cost-effective manner.

The SchoolView Data Center, an online data warehouse managed by CDE and fully accessible by the public, provides comprehensive information about Colorado's schools and districts including state accountability results, enrollment demographics, attendance and graduation rates, district or school level attainment on academic achievement and growth, closing achievement gaps and postsecondary readiness. All

districts in the consortium will use a common system to track individual student demographics and performance data to create individual student reports and improvement plans. The Consortium will develop a website to provide public access to the scope of work for the grant, progress reports, contact information for staff, relevant budget data, aggregate student achievement, and stories of successes.

The plan presented describes in detail activities to ensure that infrastructure supports personalized learning. Some structures are already in place to support the goals of the project across the varied districts.

Score medium

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Currently the Colorado Department of Education is implementing a State Personnel Development Grant (SPGD) to improve educational outcomes for all students by providing funding and technical support to assist in reforming and improving systems for professional development. The system supports the creation and implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports through an integrated Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) framework. The two programs, RtI and PBIS, serve as a statewide continuous improvement model focused on personalized learning and responding to the unique needs of each student. RtI is a continuum of evidence that connects general, compensatory, gifted, and special education in providing high quality, standards-based instruction and intervention matched to students' academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs. PBIS is designed to establish and maintain effective school environments that maximize academic achievement and behavioral competence of all learners. Five districts within the consortium are already implementing PBIS and the consortium districts are familiar with RtI. An Implementation Rubrics Guidebook has been developed for RtI.</p> <p>There are six components to Colorado's RtI: leadership, problem-solving, curriculum and instruction, assessment, positive school climate, and family and community. The rubric describes four stages of growth to guide implementation and evaluation: emerging, developing, operationalizing, and optimizing. Targeted "guiding questions" related to structures, processes and procedures, and professional development required for successfully progressing from "emerging" to "optimizing" help to identify areas of need and appropriate intervention.</p> <p>The RtI model supports personalized learning by raising questions about data driven instructional practices for groups of students and individual students, how families and students are involved in problem-solving and assessment, professional development that supports student-centered assessment, how problem solving supports outcomes for individual students, how equitable access is ensured for all students, and how families are provided learning opportunities to partnering and student learning.</p> <p>The RtI model provides an improvement process for monitoring and reporting progress toward goals. The findings of the RtI model will be reported regularly to Executive Director, the Personalized Learning Steering Committee and the Superintendents' Advisory Council and progress reports published quarterly on SLV website.</p> <p>Updated budget reports will be provided at every meeting of the Personalized Learning Steering Committee. Budget reports including year-to-year expenditures will be updated and posted monthly on the Consortium website.</p> <p>The plan provides for reporting progress towards goals but it does not appear to have sufficient staff to fully implement the continuous improvement model.</p> <p>Score medium</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strategies for ongoing communication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SLV Consortium website with regular updates, progress reports on projects printed reports for members without internet access open meetings of the Personalized Learning Steering Committee meeting agendas published one week in advance on the Consortium website and each participating district's website public comment period in the agenda of face-to-face meetings Executive Director will seek feedback from local business associations such as Rotary, Lions Club, and the Chamber of 		

Commerce

The Consortium will use social media outlets such as Twitter and Facebook, targeted e-mails, press releases and provide interviews to local media. Internal stakeholders such as parents, teachers, and administrators will be encouraged to provide feedback through electronic surveys, during public comment periods at school board meetings and during annual "town hall" meetings.

Broad plan for gaining input and ongoing communication.

Score high

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Superintendents selected performance measurements that are both ambitious and achievable. District and school performance framework reports provide a snapshot of the district's or school's level of attainment on academic achievement, growth, growth gaps and postsecondary readiness. For districts evaluation of overall performance on these indicators lead to accreditation designation. For schools performance on indicators leads to the type of improvement plan the school will implement. Leading indicators were selected to inform leaders on overall program progress. Educator effectiveness tools are in the process of being implemented statewide. Forecasts included in charts were projected based on probable baseline data.

Benchmarks and literacy metrics align with program initiatives described throughout the proposal. Social, emotional and wellness data was selected to focus on risk factors that are known to limit student progress, including student engagement, mental health, and substance abuse metrics.. Attendance rates will also be measured as additional on-track indicators.

Although the Consortium has collaborated in collecting and aggregating data at the time of submission three metrics were not collectable. They include: NWEA Benchmark data, DIBELS data and attendance rates. The Consortium will make a priority of collecting this data and it will not be problem in the long term.

Considering the complexity of working with 14 districts and 48 schools spread over the San Luis Valley, the applicant has provided baseline, target for four years, and post-grant data for number of students with effective/highly effective teachers/principals, and percent of students with effective/highly effective teachers and principals for the Consortium and each of the schools.

Chart for age appropriate populations PreK-3 , grades 4-8, and grades 9-12 for both reading and math do not include data (not available at time of proposal submission) as explained above

Chart for reading levels end of year for grades 1 and 2 based on baseline estimated from 5 district average. Engagement/Participation in the Early Steps to School Success provided for PreK-K for all participating students and TCAP Reading for % proficient and above provided from 1st year measures for 3rd grade.

Social/emotional growth for all students is provided based on using Healthy Kids Survey. Reading proficiency for all students and subgroups of ELL, Minority and FRL are provided for grades 3-8.

Performance measure on if work is viewed as meaningful with % who responded always/often for grades 6-8 for all students, percent of students reporting depression in grades 6-8 for all students, alcohol use in past 30 days for students in grades 7-8, and TCAP math % proficient and advanced for grades 6-8.

Chart provided for all participating students and districts for grades 9-12 with number of students and percent who complete and submit Free Application for Federal Student Aid.

Chart for grades 9-12 students for performance measure on attendance rates, ACT scores, social emotional growth using Healthy Kids Survey (not reported), interesting classes (% very, or quite), importance of what is learned in school for later life (% very or quite), often that work in school is meaningful or important (% always /often), % reporting symptoms of depression, % reporting alcohol use in past 30 days.

Applicant made a good effort to identify ambitious and yet achievable performance measures that will inform and support successful implementation of the grant.

Score low high

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The PLSC, ED and relevant Project Task Forces will use the RtI process to monitor progress on the performance measures on a regular basis. Meeting time will be devoted to analyzing results on measures to determine what modifications or adjustments are necessary for continuous improvement.</p> <p>An external evaluator will be hired to work with PLSC, the ED and IT Coordinator to establish the system for collection and analysis of appropriate data to evaluate the effectiveness of key areas. Examples, but not inclusive, of the key areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementation and operation of the inter-operable data system and learning platform • professional development • technologies employed for professional development, student learning and administration • stakeholder engagement, • grant management including finance, communications, implementation and monitoring, and staff supervision <p>The evaluation system will provide accountability and be public and transparent in terms of the use of grant funds.</p> <p>Plan needs more details to move it to a high quality plan.</p> <p>Score medium</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The SLV Consortium's budget narrative and tables clearly identify all the funds to support the project, requested grant funds, funds from the districts, state and funds from stakeholders that support specific activities associated with the proposal.</p> <p>The budget is presented overall and broken down for each of the sub-projects within the proposal: Common Core Aligned Curriculum, Formative Assessment System, Developing Students as Learners, Individual Career and Academic Planning, Standards- based Grading and Competency-based Credit Accumulation, Blended Learning, Literacy Initiative, Extending Excellent Teacher Reach, Integrated Data, Technology Infrastructure, and Project Management.</p> <p>The budget indicates the one-time costs and recurring costs after the grant ends. The narrative accompanying each sub-part explains how costs were calculated and how they will be distributed across the four years of the grant. The bulk of the expenses are one-time investments. Each of the districts have committed to use district funds to prioritize the Consortium's shared vision for personalized learning after the grant ends.</p> <p>The major investment is in infrastructure for each of the districts so that there is more extensive use of technology in classrooms and that there is a level playing field for all students and families in access to technology at home and at school. A second part of the infrastructure is the ensuring that educators have the skills, knowledge and support necessary to implement the sophisticated reform agenda.</p> <p>The budget presentation is thoughtful and sufficient to implement the proposal and to sustain it after the grant funding ends.</p> <p>Score high</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The majority of investments are one- time as described in the budget narrative. The districts have committed to sustain the project activities after the grant funding ends. Their commitment to personalized learning has provided opportunities for reallocation of funds within the</p>		

district and support from state initiatives that are aligned with the Consortium proposal will also add sustainability after the grant ends.

The applicant has a plan for sustainability. More description is needed to make it high quality.

Score medium

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The SLV Consortium is committed to augmenting the districts' resources and building local capacity through public private partnerships.

Early literacy and pre-academic skill development partnership

The high rate of economically disadvantaged results in 54 % of the students arriving at their first day of school lacking the necessary building blocks for literacy acquisition. A \$400,00 grant provided by Mile High United Way Social Innovation Fund was awarded to 10 SLV districts in 2012. In collaboration with Save the Children Federation, the grant will provide an early literacy campaign, Early Steps to School Success. Stakeholders are confident Mile High United Way will extend this grant for an additional 4 years. Over this time districts will be trained to successfully sustain the program after completion of the grant. Efforts are underway to identify resources to add the remaining four districts so that they can participate in 2013. ESSS is evidenced-based, cost-effective and a highly respected model for parents of children from birth to 5 years-old living in rural America. The objective is to build strong foundations for parenting and school readiness to help high need students achieve a lifetime of learning.

National program data indicate the success of ESSS in raising children's vocabulary acquisition which is a predictor of school success or failure. The Consortium will track and manage key ESSS indicators of: Ages and Stages of Questionnaire, Peabody Picture Vocabulary, Risk and Resource Inventory, and Individual Child Goal Plans.

The comprehensive measurement approach will focus on leading indicators to assess school readiness as well as social, emotional, and behavioral data. The data will be included in the projects data management system to inform elementary teams about students' individual skills and needs.

Health and wellness partnerships

The Healthy Eaters, Lifelong Movers (HELM) Project is made possible through a three-year, \$1.86 million grant, awarded from the Colorado Health Foundation to the Rocky Mountain Prevention Research Center at the University of Colorado Denver. Mission is to improve physical activity and healthy eating in K-12 schools throughout the San Luis Valley. HELM partners with SPARK, a nationally recognized program for promoting physical activity and physical education and to equip physical education teachers with the knowledge and skills to deliver high quality physical education. Many schools are extending the HELM agenda into content area classrooms for elementary students to link the activity to course content. Brain Boosters are another key element of the HELM project. Brain Boosters are brief exercises with the specific purpose of stimulating blood flow in order to vitalize short-term cognitive function. These activities have the potential to boost classroom engagement among students with diverse learning styles. Data tracked to monitor and improve this effort include healthy eating habits, obesity rates, student engagement in physical activity, and teacher effectiveness in this domain. This program has opened the door to additional community partnerships. The Kitchen Community provided Center district with a Learning Garden installation. Learning Gardens are easy and affordable and scalable school garden systems designed as extensions to a playground.

Risk factor monitoring partnership and continuous improvement process

A process has been established by leaders of the SLV region to monitor the youth behavioral risk factors of educational failure unique to the region. Identification is critical to align resources with the overall college and career readiness. At the heart of this process is the Healthy Kids Colorado Survey (HKCS). The domains covered by HKCS: physical activity and nutrition; unintentional injuries and violence; mental health; alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use; school and family; and sexual health (high school only). Data collected is used to inform local prevention efforts and secure funding and resources. For example, San Luis Valley Mental Health Services provides counseling support to most of the school districts at a cut-rate fee. Services address teen depression, suicide and alcohol and tobacco use.

The Boettcher Foundation recently began a Boettcher Teacher program aimed at training the best and brightest students to commit to a five-year teaching career.

Regional institutions of higher education partners include Trinidad State Community College and Adams State University. These institutions provide professional development activities for teachers, train new teachers and offer college at high school and vocational opportunities to SLV students.

For each population group the type of result is identified along with desired results. Performance measures over the life of grant and one year post-grant for baseline and target over 4 years are provided for each population.

A high quality plan to address competitive preference priority.

Score high

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Throughout its application SLV Consortium has addressed Absolute Priority 1. The consortium is committed to create personalized learning environments to improve the teaching and learning across the 48 schools and 14 districts. The proposal includes supports for teachers, intensive professional development, the creating of professional learning communities that will likely extend beyond the grant, supporting and and increasing the number of effective/highly effective teachers and leaders, expanding student options in learning with a heavy focus on individualized learning both for academic and social/emotional leaning, preparing students for college and career, decreasing the achievement gaps across groups, increasing the percent of students who graduate from high school, and creating an infrastructure so that all schools, teachers, students and parents have access to the technological tools needed to support teaching and learning.		

Total	210	143
-------	-----	-----